

REMARKS

The office action suggests that the claims do not recite a useful, concrete, and tangible result. But the case law is clear that to be useful all the claim needs is a practical use. Here, the practical use is establishing a chat session with an overlapping chat dialog box. This is a practical use since it allows people to communicate.

To be concrete, all that is required is that the technique be repeatable. It is not believed there could be any serious doubt about this in the present situation.

Finally, a tangible result requires that the claim set forth a practical application. Here, the practical application is a chat session with an overlapping chat dialog box over a web page. There is no reason why this is not a sufficient practical application. In other words, people want to discuss web pages and by having a chat session with a chat dialog box overlapping the web page, they can discuss the web page. It is practical to have a chat dialog box over the web page since clearly it facilitates communications about the web page.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If the suggestion is that the actual chat session needs to be recited, it is not seen any reason why this is so. The practical application is establishing the chat session with the overlapping dialog box.

Claim 21 claims an apparatus, which indisputably is a tangible result.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Date: June 18, 2008

Attorneys for Intel Corporation